



**Solicitation Information
November 16, 2012**

Addendum #1

RFP # 7458219

**TITLE: MULTI-DISTRICT STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (SIS)
RI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – MPA #469**

Submission Deadline: November 28, 2012 at 11:30 AM (EST)

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN EXTENDED
TO WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2012 AT 11:30 AM.**

ATTACHED PLEASE FIND:

- 1. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR ALL BIDDERS**
- 2. VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES.**

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

**Gail Walsh
Buyer II**

RFP# 7458219 – Student Information System

Supplemental Information for all potential bidders:

1. The following districts have committed to this RFP:

Central Falls
Coventry
Little Compton
Pawtucket
Providence
South Kingstown
Woonsocket
North Providence

We have strong interest from other districts as well. It is our belief that participation will increase every year.

2. Rhode Island is interested in an SIS system and all of its components, including special education. When submitting a proposal, please separately cost each of any modules that your company would provide for this functionality. This would allow districts to have more choice in their implementation options. For example, some districts will want all the functionality provided in your proposal. Others may want all except the Special Education functionality. Itemized cost proposals will be helpful towards districts as they make these decisions.

1. Proposed Solution Clarification

The RFP states that RIDE is looking for a “multi-district SIS”(Page 5) and that “RIDE would not favor many different, individual instances that would all need to be singularly supported and maintained”(Page 7).

On page 5 of the RFP, the Installation Options describe the following:

Installation Options

This RFP requires bidders to address three installation options as follows:

- *Individual installation at each LEA on servers provided by each LEA (LEA Installation Model);*
- *Hosted services on respondent provided data center (Vendor Model); and*
- *Installation on RIDE-sponsored data center (RIDE Data Center Model)*

Option A, “Individual installation at each LEA on servers provided by each LEA (LEA Installation Model)”; seems to contradict the desire for a “multi-district SIS” and the

stated fact that “RIDE would not favor many different, individual instances that would all need to be singularly supported and maintained”.

- **ANSWER: RIDE would prefer a centralized architecture. We allowed vendors to propose individual installations if they cannot support a centralized architecture. Our goal is to eliminate repeated tasks every district performs, e.g., updating software, databases, servers, etc.**

2. Please explain the overall desired system structure for the “multi-district SIS”?

For instance, is the desire to have all districts (LEAs) housed in one database that would allow seamless data flow to and from a state level(within the same database)? Or is the desire to have all districts on the same system (data model) but in different databases (for each LEA) so that data exchanges can be setup easily between these databases and to a state level database?

ANSWER: Security is important and data needs to be managed so that only the appropriate districts and personnel access appropriate data. If more than one database is needed for your solution, please detail that in your proposal. We would prefer not to sacrifice the benefits of centralized management with many individual databases. Each district will need to access its data while not being able to see other districts’ data.

3. Special Education

In regards to the Special Education functionality, **would the desired solution have the ability to manage all processes of Special Education tracking (IEP development, Special Education services tracking, etc.) or is the desire to simply track certain Special Education data elements for reporting purposes?**

ANSWER: The DESIRED solution would manage all the Special Education processes.

4. We would like to make a few statements or feedback concerning the implications of the overall request.

We strongly feel that the specific requirements of Providence School District, including the placement of staff on location, have little to do with the needs of most RI schools and districts. We’ve invested, and continue to invest, a lot of money ensuring our districts meet and exceed RI DOE reporting requirements. It was our work with RIDE that brought the ADT to districts to simplify the state reporting requirements. The uniqueness of Providence SD should be separated from the RFR to ensure a fair and competitive process.

ANSWER: If you would like to segment your proposal into what is right for Providence and what is right for most other districts, please do so. Please ensure the cost of these additional personnel resources are priced separately.

5. The specifications require specific SIF objects to be supported but does not specify SIF certification. Is current SIF certification required?

ANSWER: Certification is preferred (not required), but the proposed solution must have the ability to support SIF objects.

6. Item 5.1.24e calls for data transfers to external solutions such as EasyIEP, yet calls for inclusion of a Special Education Module. Must the SIS have an IEP application?

ANSWER: It is preferred, but if not, please indicate how you would integrate with an existing or external solution.

7. The Technology Summary states: “RIDE would not favor many different individual instances that would all need to be singularly supported and maintained”. Does RIDE expect individual LEA access to the back end data base however?

ANSWER: We expect LEAs to have access to the appropriate data they need for both federal, state, and local needs.

8. From Appendix B: “These criteria are specific to the district of Providence and will hopefully serve the needs of most LEAs. However, additional criteria may be added to accommodate other LEA-specific needs during the project lifecycle.” How would any price changes required by additional requirements for other LEAs be handled?

ANSWER: We believe Providence’s needs will address a large portion of other LEAs. However, if additional requirements come up with a particular LEA, we would expect that to be handled through a change process detailed in the bid.

9. The specifications call for a preferred architecture of a single data source in order to facilitate inter-district student data transfer. Has any work been done at the district levels to align data to enable inter-district student data transfer?

ANSWER: Yes, work has been performed. We are in the process of aligning district courses to SCED; we have a common dictionary that we are aligning with CEDS; through state reporting and state data warehouse needs, the districts have aligned their SIS fields to the state data dictionary; and work is underway on e-transcript functionality.

10. The scope of work calls for: vendor(s) selected. Will more than one be selected as is done in most states?

ANSWER: Our desire is to have one selected vendor (and this is preferred by many districts); however, we will choose the right amount of vendors based on the proposals to meet our needs.

11. What other services does RIDE anticipate providing if they chose to host the SIS. Would RIDE be providing first level support for the application or hardware and system support?

ANSWER: We are making no assumptions and therefore your proposal should list all options that you would recommend to meet the needs detailed in the proposal.

12. If RIDE hosts that data, will districts be charged for these services?

ANSWER: We are not sure how this question is necessary towards completing this RFP. How the SEAs and LEAs determine cost distribution is an internal matter.

13. LEAs have been invited to participate in the procurement process. How will these LEAs participate in the vendor selection process?

ANSWER: They will be represented in the selection process.

14. Must a LEA finalize a decision to participate prior to a vendor and deployment decision has been made?

ANSWER: No. We are interested in a single, centralized solution that will be a voluntary phased in approach.

15. Section 6 – Page 9 –

The technical proposal should be 10-20 pages in length, respond to each area of the required elements listed above, and contain a cost proposal using the forms in Appendix A. Supplemental information may be appended to the technical proposal.

Are these 10-20 pages in addition to the 40 page requirement? So the total pages could be 50-60 pages?

ANSWER: Yes; however brevity with quality is preferred over quantity.

16. Section 10 – Page 10 –

A Proposal that addresses all the requests addressed in this document, including appendices A and B. Technical and Cost Proposals should be included in separate sealed envelopes.

Does this statement indicate that we need one envelope for Cost, and one envelope for the all other response items? **Yes.**

17. What does “approximately 40” pages mean? Is it better to respond completely or stay within 40 pages?

ANSWER: Completely. See question and answer above.

18. In Appendix A- can vendors provide a total cost of training / project Management, etc. that is inclusive of all costs as part of their proposal? We typically provide a total cost for onsite training that includes “ALL” costs. Thus it’s very easy for districts to compare vendor to vendors total costs. If we are allowed to do this would Appendix A be required?

ANSWER: We require the detail that is in Appendix A.

19. Appendix B

5.1.26.a

Must be able to generate a pickup for any district personnel.

ANSWER: Unfortunately this was a typo. Any district personnel should be able to access a list that will provide detail student information pertaining to who is allowed to pick up the student from school.

20. Is the contract resulting from this RFP funded by ARRA funds? **No.**

21. Appendix A – Budget for Multi-Year Projects - The sheets are for consultant expense categories and not for product licensing and support. Do you want us to:

- a. use these sheets completing these categories where appropriate and adding the licensing, support, hosting, etc. **Yes.**
- b. may we use our own format? **No.**
- c. do you have a different format for those kinds of expenditures? **No.**

22. Are the responses due the day after Thanksgiving?

ANSWER: The submission deadline is being extended to Wednesday, November 28, 2012 at 11:30 am.

23. Do you have Appendix B in Microsoft Word format to assist us in completing the document?

ANSWER: Yes, please see .zip file in column labeled 'Info.' Click on the letter 'D.'

24. 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 relative to on-site staff. I understand that these are the people and the skills that will be supporting the system(s) on a daily basis. We will provide as part of our response the necessary advanced training for the district(s) to be self supporting and we will provide backup should on-site vendor support be required.

ANSWER: Some districts may desire and require on-site personnel for data needs. Preference may be given to vendors who can also provide this type of support model.

25. 5.1.22.d, the vendor will install the SIF Zone Integration Server. The vendor will install and connect to the district's acquired ZIS?

ANSWER: Yes, and ensure that it is properly connected. Please ensure that these costs are itemized.

26. Page 4 - Is Woonsocket's participation guaranteed? If so, what is the estimated timing of when Woonsocket might contract with the vendor?

ANSWER: Yes, 2013/2014 school year.

27. Page 4 - Which are the 9 independent charter schools that would be early followers?

ANSWER: A consortium will likely be formed but there is no specific timetable.

28. Is the participation of these 9 charter schools guaranteed? No. If so, what is the estimated timing of when these 9 charter schools might contract with the vendor?

29. Page 5 - Support plan should include options for onsite personnel. Onsite at each LEA or onsite at RIDE? Onsite at each LEA likely would cost more than onsite at RIDE, since RIDE is central and LEAs are geographically distributed.

ANSWER: Please provide the support plan that is the most cost-effective towards meeting the state and LEA needs. We do not expect on-site personnel will be needed in all districts; however, Providence will likely require it.

30. Appendix A - Is the intent that the forms in Appendix A cover only services and that the vendor would include its own table for license/subscription pricing?

ANSWER: Appendix A should also include licensing/subscription pricing.

31. Appendix D - Since we are proposing IEP, 504 and ELL, we will need the student counts for each district listed in Appendix D as follows:

- Special ed (for IEP)
- Students qualifying for 504 (for 504)
- English language learners (ELL)

ANSWER: Please visit the following site for this information. The FRED (Frequently Requested Education Data) link will probably be the most helpful: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/ride/data.aspx>

32. 5.1.22.d This module includes the installation of a SIF Zone Server at PSD. Are you looking for the vendor to provide a ZIS or would do you have your own?

ANSWER: Please provide an itemized list for the vendor installing and connecting the ZIS server.

33. Page 5 & 9 - The RFP states that “The vendor(s) selected to provide a SIS will enter into a Master Price Agreement (MPA) with the State of Rhode Island, in accordance with the terms of this solicitation.”

On page 9 is states The vendor(s) selected under this solicitation will be placed on the qualified vendor list for MPA #469.” Is it RIDE’s intention to select a single vender, or multiple venders if requirements are met?

ANSWER: Our desire is to have one selected vendor; however, we will choose the right amount of vendors based on the proposals to meet our needs.

34. Page 6 & 31 - The RFP requirements ask for a RTI Module. How is this different from the RTI module that RIDE is providing districts through the IMS?

ANSWER: The requirements are the same and allows districts choice.

35. Page 24 - The RFP lists a “Special Education Evaluation Module.” It details much of the functionality that many commonly use IEP systems have today, but doesn’t ask specifically for IEP creation.

Is this module intended to be an alternative to commonly used IEP systems being used by Rhode Island districts today?

ANSWER: Yes. The functionality should include IEP creation. This would allow districts to move towards this solution from their current application if they so choose.

36. 5.1.5d - What are the expectations, details around a user defined dashboard? Is it taking individual report views to build a personalized view or is it something different?

ANSWER: Desired: Custom dashboard for district and public viewing of district specific data points.

37. 5.1.26a - Is this inclusive of all of the reports mentioned throughout the RFP or are they in addition to more reports? In addition.

38. 5.1.5b - Are all reports expected to be in English and Spanish as all screens are within this section? No.

- END -